Exhibit B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : Cr. No. 02-10259-PBS

•

V. : Courtroom No. 13

1 Courthouse Way

ELVIN MERCADO : Boston, MA 02210-3002 : 9:00 a.m., Thursday

July 22, 2003

Evidentiary Sentencing
Day Two

Before:

THE HONORABLE PATTI B. SARIS, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

Peter Levett, Assistant United States Attorney, 1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200, Boston, MA 02210-3002, on behalf of the Government.

Rappaport & Delaney (by Steven J. Rappaport, Esquire), 228 Central Street, Lowell, MA 01852, on behalf of the Defendant.

Marie L. Cloonan
Federal Court Reporter
1 Courthouse Way - Room 7200
Boston, MA 02210 - 617-439-7086
Mechanical Steno - Transcript by Computer

1...

2-112

(Defendant Exhibit A, Criminal Docket - Brandon Greenwood, admitted into evidence.)

(Defendant Exhibit B, Transcript of Detention Hearing held on 10-16-02, admitted into evidence.)

MR. RAPPAPORT: Other than that, there is no case in chief.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, here's the issue.

I have to leave here at five of one. I had no idea this hearing was going to go so long today. So, we'll see what we can do before then. Otherwise, we'll just have to finish it this afternoon.

So, your recommendation -- let me just first say that I think the total offense level -- let me just say this. I find that the amount of the drugs is under a hundred grams. The government is not pressing that issue as I understand it. And, there is concern about the criminal history category. But, at least I think everyone agrees that he is a career offender on the face of the record. The question is whether I depart, what we'll discuss in a second. But, the total offense level 31, the criminal history category is 6, which means the range is 188 to 235 months imprisonment, 72 months of supervised release, \$15,000 to \$20 million fine and a thousand dollar special assessment.

Is that correct?

1	MS. FOSTER: That's correct.
2	THE COURT: All of that is correct.
3	All right. So, we move on, now, essentially to the
4	government's recommendation and, then, I'll hear a motion
5	for downward departure. And, then, we'll come back to you.
6	What's your recommendation?
7	MR. LEVITT: Well, your Honor, the government
8	recommends that the defendant be sentenced within the
9	guideline range. Primarily, the government would want to be
10	heard on the departure issue.
11	THE COURT: You're wherever I want to be?
12	MR. LEVITT: Yes, your Honor, within the guideline
13	range. I mean, my view is that it should be in the middle
14	of the guideline range, rather than top or bottom.
15	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
16	Mr. Rappaport, here's the issue at this point. The
17	only issue is whether it's a 6 or a 5.
18	MR. RAPPAPORT: I understand, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: All right.
20	So, do you want to make your argument on that now
21	and
22	MR. RAPPAPORT: Yes. Very briefly, Judge at
23	least as brief as I can be.
24	My actual concern when I took a look at this was I
25	had a 17-year-old kid who hack in 1994 three days apart

had two street-level distribution cases or possession with intent to distribute cases, which clearly were treated by the Court as if they were one case back at that time. seemed that this was outside the heartland of what we would consider the ordinary career criminal.

He was, as I say, a young man. He was a special education student. He didn't make it through high school. He had a history of mental health problems. He was a poly substance abuser at that time himself. And, it just seemed to me that, bearing in mind that technically they put him into that career offender category -- and, frankly, Judge, when you look at the PSR, I mean, we're talking about an incredible increase in his criminal -- his sentencing exposure. It just seemed that this was a case where the Court should consider departing.

And, I want to say something else. While I recognize that there are ten criminal history points here, I also want the Court to understand that only three of those criminal history points -- one for the offense itself, and, then, either two or three -- I think it's two for it having occurred -- this offense having occurred, I believe, within five years of it? There was a possession of marihuana case that Mr. Mercado, uncounseled, pled quilty to. No question that he pled guilty to it. There was no time involved in the case.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2-115

	And,	then,	Ιg	juess	it	was	with	nin t	wo	year	rs af	ter
the	period of	probat	tion	that	: he	. Was	on	that	: ca	ase,	that	he
was	charged w	ith th	is c	ase.								

So, he gets the one point for the possession of marihuana, that uncounseled case. And, then, he gets two points for this case happening within a short time thereafter.

Judge, I understand that Probation properly gave him those career history points. But, again, let's take a look at the underlying case that he pled guilty to, a street possession of marihuana.

I would submit that --

THE COURT: Well, there were distribution counts -MR. RAPPAPORT: No, no, no. I --

THE COURT: -- to the two that created the career offender points.

MR. RAPPAPORT: Oh, yes. With the Court's indulgence, I'm coming off of that for one moment and just saying that when we talk about his career -- excuse me -- his criminal history points, it made him a 10. It would have made him a Category 5. He is, I believe, 10 points.

THE COURT: Can I just -- as I started off, I'm really actually not that very far from where I started on this. If this had just been a distribution, one distribution that made him a career offender, I think you'd

have a terrific argument -- two small distributions when he was 17. But, here, I've got a series of distributions over a period of time, at least -- we may not know exactly what the drug weight is, but a series of distributions to this informant before he was caught and after he was caught. supervised at least one other quy, the Brillon kid, and was involved -- at least use that word -- in a gang.

So, how can I say it significantly over represents the seriousness of criminal history? That's the problem I It isn't -- if they had just caught him on one distribution, I would say you're right, I'm going to downwardly depart, I do have the discretion, and I find I do. But, it's not that case.

MR. RAPPAPORT: Well, I felt it was, Judge, because of the significant increase that he gets as a career offender -- I mean, we're talking about going from a 15 to a Basically, what it would ordinarily have been, even at a Category 5, 37 to 46 months to 188 to 235 months.

THE COURT: I agree, it's rough.

MR. RAPPAPORT: It's very rough.

And, when one looks at what are the predicate offenses that put him into that and we see the 17-year-old kid, three days apart, getting these cases, it just seems to me that it's not only rough, that is outside of what one would consider the heartland of career offenders, to take

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

him from basically a three-year sentence up to a sentence well in excess of ten years -- close to a 15-year sentence.

I would submit that that is rough and is outside the heartland and that Mr. Mercado should be given consideration as to departure, at least in terms of the criminal history category, down to the criminal history category 5.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Anything you want to say briefly?

MR. LEVITT: Yes, your Honor.

The career offender provisions were designed to be rough. They were designed to deal with recidivists like Mr. Mercado.

I think the important thing to do when you're looking at Mr. Mercado is look at both the history and what he was charged with here and what the evidence is he was doing throughout the period that he was charged.

And, in that respect, not only was he charged here with a series of distributions, but the testimony is that he was -- he had been providing heroin to the cooperating witness for several months prior to that. That he was supplying to Sammy Guzman, he was supplying Vincente Rodriguez, who were then supplying others.

In addition, as the Court has recognized, the evidence is that he was at least a key member, the

government would submit. The evidence is clean that he was a leader of this Immortal Outlaw street gang, a violent street gang. And, this is consistent with his history.

You know, the Court has focused on these two heroin distribution charges. And, the government looks at the fact that they are three days apart and takes a different view of them, which is, as soon as he got out on the first one, he went right back out and did what he was doing before -- three days later, while out on pre-trial release, he's distributing heroin again -- the same drug that he was distributing ten years later.

But, there are other offenses here. And, I know the Court has characterized them as relatively minor. But, the government disagrees. And, I think the pre-trial -- I think the --

THE COURT: Well, I know what those are. So ... MR. LEVIT: Okay.

But, I would urge the Court to read Paragraph 114 of the PSR, which describes one of those offenses and what the defendant did, in a stolen car, crashing into two other cars, driving the wrong way on a one-way street, struggling with the police officer who arrested him.

The career offender provisions are designed for the defendant with his type of history, that he's caught doing the exact same thing now.

2-119

THE COURT: Thank you.

Does he want to say anything?

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to apologize to the Court, first of all. I would like to apologize to my family. I would like to say how sorry I am about this.

That's it, your Honor.

THE COURT: I know it's a very emotional moment.

This is what I'm going to do. I'm going to -- I decline to downwardly depart. I do, however, want the pre-sentence report rewritten, I think, for purposes of categorizing him. You can simply say he was a member of the gang and who the other members were. I don't think you need to get into the leadership or nonleadership thing. But, I think it's important for placement that they know who the other members are, so the BOP can make a decision about whether to place them in the same institution.

MS. FOSTER: Yes, your Honor. Just for a clarification, you want leadership removed, stricken.

THE COURT: Yes. I was thinking something along the lines of: Elvin Mercado was involved in The Immortal Outlaws gang in the Lawrence, Massachusetts area. They were formed in the 1990s and that he was a -- you could say he was a -- you could say something like he was a trusted member of the group, or something. Maybe he's a leader, maybe he isn't. It's not important to the guideline range.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And	they	ma	y un	fairly	penalize	him	in	the	system.	So,	we'll
rewi	rite	it	that	way.							

So, I'm going to give -- decline, as I say, to downwardly depart. I am going to give the absolute lowest end of the range, which I think is fully appropriate here, which is 188 months' imprisonment, with a recommendation to a 500-hour drug treatment program in the Boston area, ideally, so he can see his daughter who I think has been back there.

Is that correct?

MR. RAPPAPORT: His daughter was here yesterday. She couldn't make it today.

THE COURT: She looks just like him. hopefully, she'll be able to visit.

Ninety-six months of supervised release, no fine. So, hopefully, he can use that money from his business to take the child support obligation to his girlfriend, and a thousand dollar special assessment.

MS. FOSTER: Your Honor, there's a requirement of 72 months of supervised release.

THE COURT: Do I have the old number? I'm sorry. Seventy-two months of supervised I have the old number. release. I think that came from the earlier. And, then, a thousand dollar special assessment.

I provide as a condition substance abuse treatment

FORM CSR - LASEH REPORTERS PAPER & MFG. CO. 800-628-6313